1	THE LAW OFFICE OF		
2	JACK FITZGERALD, PC		
3	JACK FITZGERALD (SBN 257370) jack@jackfitzgeraldlaw.com		
	TREVOR M. FLYNN (SBN 253362)		
4	trevor@jackfitzgeraldlaw.com		
5	MELANIE PERSINGER (SBN 275423)		
6	melanie@jackfitzgeraldlaw.com Hillcrest Professional Building		
7	3636 Fourth Avenue, Suite 202		
8	San Diego, California 92103 Phone: (619) 692-3840		
9	Fax: (619) 362-9555		
10	THE LAW OFFICE OF		
11	PAUL K. JOSEPH, PC PAUL K. JOSEPH (SBN 287057)		
12	paul@pauljosephlaw.com		
13	4125 W. Pt. Loma Blvd. No. 206		
	San Diego, California 92110 Phone: (619) 767-0356		
14	Fax: (619) 331-2943		
15	Counsel for Plaintiff and the Proposed Cla	iss	
16			COLIDE
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
18	NORTHERN DIST	MCI OF CE	LII ORIVIA
19	PRESTON JONES and SHIRIN	Case No:	3:16-cv-00711-HSG
20	DELALAT, on behalf of themselves, all others similarly situated, and the general	DECLARATION OF PAUL K. JOSEPH IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S	
21	public,		N FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES
22	Plaintiffs,	AND CO	
23	v.	Date:	July 13, 2017
24	NUTIVA, INC.,	Time:	2:00 p.m.
	Defendant.	Place:	Courtroom 2, 4 th Floor
25		Judge:	Hon. Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.
26			
27			
28			

Jones et al. v. Nutiva, Inc., No. 16-cv-711-HSG
DECLARATION OF PAUL K JOSEPH IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES & COSTS

I, Paul K Joseph, declare as follows:

- 1. I am a member in good standing of the state bar of California, and of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Central, Eastern, and Southern Districts of California. I make this Declaration based on my own personal knowledge in support of plaintiff's motions for attorneys' fees and costs.
- 2. I have been practicing plaintiffs' side class action prosecution since 2012 and have been operating my own practice since May 2015, which focuses exclusively on consumer protection class actions. A firm biography is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 3. My practice is to keep contemporaneous records and to regularly record time records in the normal course of business. My practice is to bill in 6-minute (tenth-of-an-hour) increments and I kept time records in this case consistent with that practice.

My Billing Rate

- 4. I am the Principal of my firm and graduated law school in 2012. My current rate is \$400 per hour.
- 5. This rate is consistent with the rate that the Honorable Katherine Bacal, of the San Diego County Superior Court, approved for me earlier this year, on February 24, 2017. (See Fitzgerald Decl. Ex. B at 2.)
- 6. This rate is also consistent with the prevailing rates in the community for attorneys of similar experience, skill, and reputation, as reflected in recent Northern District of California decisions..
- 7. In March 2017, the Honorable Edward M. Chen approved a rate of \$400 for Karl Sung, an associate with four years of experience in civil litigation. *H.P.D. Consolidation, Inc. v. Pina*, Case No. 15-cv-05309-EMC, 2017 WL 1046960, at *9 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 20, 2017). This rate compares favorably to my same rate of \$400, given my additional year of experience, and because I have been acting as a partner in this matter.
- 8. Also in March 2017, Judge Chen approved a rate of \$420 for junior associate Peter C. Holm, who graduated in 2014. *Dropbox, Inc. v. Thru Inc.*, Case No. 15-cv-01741-EMC, 2017 WL 914273, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 8, 2017); *see also id.*, Dkt. No. 153, at 14; *id.*,

Dkt. No. 154, at 8. *Compare* Peter C. Holm Lawyer Biography (https://tinyurl.com/khkusko). This rates also compares favorably to my rate of \$425, given that I have 2 years more experience than Mr. Holm.

- 9. In June 2015, the Honorable William H. Orrick approved a rate of \$640 for an associate with less than five years of experience, and a rate of \$710 for an associate with approximately six years of experience. *Wynn v. Chanos*, Case No. 14-cv-04329-WHO, 2015 WL 3832561, at *2, *6 (N.D. Cal. June 19, 2015), *aff'd*, --- Fed. Appx. ----, No. 15-15639, 2017 WL 1149508 (9th Cir. Mar. 28, 2017) (Mem.). This compares favorably to my rate of \$400 because I have almost five years of experience, and these rates were approved nearly two years ago.
- 10. In February 2015, the Honorable Laura Beeler approved a rate of \$450 for associate Marie McCrary who graduated in 2008 (approximately 6.5 years of experience at that time). *Miller v. Ghirardelli Chocolate Co.*, No. 12-CV-04936-LB, 2015 WL 758094, at *6 & n.3 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 20, 2015); *see also id.*, Dkt. No. 148-1, at ¶¶ 70, 74. My lower \$400 rate compares favorably given that I have nearly as much experience, and more than 2 years that have passed since Ms. McCrary's rate was approved.
- 11. The reasonableness of my rate is further demonstrated by the rates at which partners have been approved, which are well above my requested rate of \$400. *See Prison Legal News v. Schwarzenegger*, 608 F.3d 446, 455 (9th Cir. 2010) (district court did not abuse its discretion in awarding 2008 hourly rates for Bay Area attorneys of up to \$875 for a partner and \$425 for an associate with approximately five years of experience); *Gutierrez v. Wells Fargo, N.A.*, 2015 WL 2438274, at *5 (N.D. Cal. May 21, 2015) (awarding attorneys' fees for partners who billed between \$475 and \$975 per hour and associates with hourly rates between \$300 and \$490); *Banas v. Volcano Corp.*, 47 F. Supp. 3d 957, 965 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (accepting hourly rates ranging from \$355 to \$1,095 for partners and associates in the San Francisco Bay Area); *Minor v. Christie's, Inc.*, 2011 WL 902235, at *7 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2011) (approving rates of \$600 \$700 for partners); *Iguacu, Inc. v. Filho*, 2014 WL 3668574, at *3 (N.D. Cal. July 23, 2014) (approving discounted partner rates of \$485 \$625); *In re*

Magsafe Apple Power Adapter Litig., 2015 WL 428105, at *12 (N.D.Cal. Jan. 30, 2015) ("In the Bay Area, reasonable hourly rates for partners range from \$560 to \$800"); Wynn, 2015 WL 3832561, at *6 (approving rates of \$875-\$1,085 for partners).

Time Spent on this Matter

- 12. In calculating my reasonable lodestar for purposes of this fee application, I began with my raw records, then carefully reviewed all individual entries and exercised billing discretion to cut time or entries. Specifically, I cut entries that were administrative, such as preparing chambers copies, service of documents, arranging court reporting services for depositions, travel arrangements, calendaring deadlines, and downloading docket entries.
- 13. Likewise, I cut or did not bill a large number of entries related to case management, such as the vast majority of calls with co-counsel. Mr. Fitzgerald and I, for instance, discuss case strategy and assignments but rarely bill for such case management time. I estimate that we have each spent at least twenty hours conducting such calls over the course of the litigation, for which we are not seeking reimbursement despite that these calls are vital to the effective coordination of efforts and plaintiff's ultimate success.
- 14. Both firms also cut entries that were exclusively directed towards proving damages, including, for example, work with survey and damages experts, and discovery related solely to Nutiva's sales and the pricing of its coconut oils. In total we cut 13.3 hours related to damages.
- 15. After an initial round of cuts, we arranged the hours into tasks, then reviewed them again and made additional cuts. The result of this review-and-cut process is reflected in the detailed time records attached to the Fitzgerald Declaration as Exhibits D-E.

23 | /// 24 | /// 25 | /// 26 | /// 27 | ///

///

Similarly, both firms incurred expenses for which we are seeking 16. reimbursement. Those expenses are set forth in Exhibit F to the Fitzgerald Declaration. Notably, my firm is not seeking reimbursement of costs often billed to clients including photocopying, first class postage, and legal research. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. Executed this 22nd day of May, 2017, in San Diego, California. /s/ Paul K. Joseph By: Paul K. Joseph